

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, 15, 34, 38, 41, 42, and 44 are amended, claims 2-12, 17-33, and 43 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 45-48 are newly added. Claims 1, 14-16, 34-42, and 44-48 are pending for consideration. Applicant believes this filing is fully responsive to the Office Action, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Almatrahi for participating in a teleconference with Applicant's representative on October 26, 2010. During the teleconference, certain types of clarifying claim amendments to claim 1 were discussed that, if made, Examiner Almatrahi indicated would overcome the art of record, possibly subject to further search. Amended independent claims 1, 34, and 41 include recitations such as those discussed in the teleconference.

Applicant also thanks Examiner Almatrahi for contacting Applicant's representative on November 1, 2010 to confirm that the proposed amendments to claim 1 would overcome the art of record, including a non-patent literature reference by Hiranaka et al. At this time, Examiner Almatrahi also requested that Applicant provide remarks distinguishing claim 1 from Hiranaka to help clarify the record. Although Hiranaka was not applied against independent claim 1 in the Office Action, Applicant has complied with the Examiner's request and provided remarks distinguishing claim 1 from Hiranaka for the purposes of expediting prosecution.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully submits a replacement Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement which includes "a blank space next to each document to be

considered, for the Examiner's initials." The Examiner's objections are thus believed to be obviated. If this Information Disclosure Statement does not obviate the Examiner's objections and still fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out exactly what is lacking in Applicant's IDS.

Objection to Claim 44

Claim 44 is objected to for certain informalities. Without conceding the propriety of this objection, Applicant has amended the claim in a manner that appears to render this objection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2005/0137904 to Lane et al. (hereinafter "Lane") in view of US Publication No. 2005/0104719 to Ramamurthy et al. (hereinafter "Ramamurthy").

Claims 15, 34-42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lane in view of Ramamurthy and Hiranaka et al. NPL "Multimedia and Routing Specific Applications on IPv6 Networks" (hereinafter "Hiranaka").

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lane in view of Ramamurthy, Hiranaka and further in view of official notice.

Response to § 103 Rejection

In making out the rejection of independent claim 1, the Office relies on Lane and Ramamurthy and argues that it would have been obvious to combine

their teachings. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that neither Lane nor Ramamurthy, either singly or in combination, teach all the claimed subject matter.

As discussed above, the Examiner agreed that amendments to independent claim 1 such as those presented herein would overcome the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lane and Ramamurthy. For example, amended claim 1 recites "appending the predetermined suffix to the global routing prefix received from the asset identification tag to create the uniform resource locator for the selected asset lookup service." As discussed during the interview, neither Lane nor Ramamurthy teaches or suggests at least these features of independent claim 1.

As requested by the Examiner, Applicant provides the following remarks regarding Hiranaka, which also fails to teach or suggest these features of claim 1. Hiranaka discloses examples of using the Internet Protocol Version 6 ("IPv6") addressing space for various applications, such as video conferencing and phone number mapping (Hiranaka, abstract). For example, an electronic device can use a network address comprising both routing information and ID information, such as a MAC address (Hiranaka, section 3.3). However, Hiranaka is silent as to both "appending [a] predetermined suffix to [a] global routing prefix" and "creat[ing] a uniform resource locator," as recited by independent claim 1. Thus, as agreed to by the Examiner during the interview, Hiranaka does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Lane and Ramamurthy.

Claims 14-16, and new claims 45-48, depend from independent claim 1. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in their respective base claims, are not taught or suggested by Lane or Ramamurthy, either singly or in combination. The further rejection of claim 15 over Lane and Ramamurthy in view of Hiranaka is not seen to add anything of significance, given the distinguishing features of claim 1

discussed above.

Turning to amended independent claim 34, which recites "formatting a uniform resource locator by appending a predetermined uniform asset lookup service suffix to the received global grouting prefix" (emphasis added). For at least similar reasons as discussed during the interview with respect to independent claim 1, none of Lane, Ramamurthy, or Hiranaka teaches or suggests at least these recitations of independent claim 34. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow this claim.

Claims 35-40 depend from claim 34. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in their respective base claims, are not taught or suggested by Lane, Ramamurthy, or Hiranaka, either singly or in combination.

Turning to amended independent claim 41, which recites "formatting a uniform resource locator for a selected asset lookup service by appending a predetermined uniform asset lookup service suffix for the selected asset lookup service to the received global routing prefix" (emphasis added). For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, none of Lane, Ramamurthy, or Hiranaka teaches or suggests at least the above-identified recitations of independent claim 41. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection and allow this claim.

Claims 42 and 44 depend from claim 41, and these dependent claims are allowable as depending from their respective allowable base claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in their respective base claims, are not taught or suggested by

Lane, Ramamurthy, or Hiranaka, either singly or in combination.

In making out the rejection of claim 43, the Office relies on Lane, Ramamurthy and Hiranaka, and on “official notice that associating the global routing prefix with a model of the asset, a manufacturer of the asset, a weight of the asset, and a color of the asset is old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made,” and argues that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings (Office Action at page 10). Claim 43 is canceled, and therefore the rejection is moot. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully traverses the Official Notice.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this communication, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: 2010-11-15

By: /paul mitchell/

Paul W. Mitchell, Reg. No.: 44,453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382